



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,980	08/02/2001	Arun C. Alex	01-472	6119
7590 08/15/2005			EXAMINER	
McDonnell Boehnen hulbert & Berghoff			PATEL, JAY P	
32nd Floor			ART UNIT	
300 S. Wacker Drive			PAPER NUMBER	
Chicago, IL 60606			2666	

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/920,980

Applicant(s)

ALEX ET AL.

Examiner

Jay P. Patel

Art Unit

2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 May 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2, 5, 9, 13-14, 17-18, 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Magret (US Patent No. 6856624 B2).

3. In regards to claims 1, 17, 23 and 24, Magret anticipates a method for establishing a connection with a mobile node comprising receiving a registration request. Magret discloses registration processes executed by a mobile node, a foreign agent and a home agent in figures 7, 8 and 9 respectively.

In further regards Magret also anticipates determining a tunnel identifier, wherein the tunnel identifier is independent of a home address of the mobile node and address of a home agent. Magret discloses that the home agent invokes an encapsulation process to create a first tunnel having the temporary address as an endpoint and a second tunnel having the foreign agent care-of-address as a destination address. As a side note, the process works in such a way that an inbound packet is encapsulated into another packet having the foreign agent care-of-address as a destination address. Therefore, since the second tunnel has a foreign agent care-of-address, it anticipates a

Art Unit: 2666

tunnel identifier that is independent of the home address of the mobile node and independent of the address of the home agent (see figures 10A-10C and column 11, lines 20-44).

In further regards, transmitting the registration request to the home agent, the registration request including the tunnel identifier is anticipated by figure 11B step 220 where a packet can be reverse tunneled to the home agent by the foreign agent. It is noted the packet can be a registration message itself.

In further regards, receiving a response to the request and, responsively activating a connection is anticipated by figure 10B step 192 when the Home Agent receives encapsulated packet.

In further regards, receiving data packets from the home agent in response to transmitting the registration request, the data packets including the tunnel identifier is anticipated by figures 10A and 10B steps 186, 188, 190 and 192 where the home agent creates an inner and an outer tunnel respectively and forwards the encapsulated packets to the foreign agent and the foreign agent receives the encapsulated packet.

In further regards, the step of identifying the connection using the tunnel identifier is anticipated by figure 11B step 220, the inner packet is reverse tunneled to the home agent. It is noted that the foreign agent reverse tunnels the outgoing inner packet to the appropriate home agent using the retrieved home agent address (see column 12, lines 14-19).

In further regards, the step of routing the packets along the connection is also anticipated by figure 11B step 220, the inner packet is reverse tunneled to the home agent.

In regards to claims 2 and 18, the data packets received from the home agent including a header and the header includes the tunnel identifier is anticipated by figure 5 code field 104 and the care of address field 112 which includes "T" bit indicating a request to the home agent to accept a reverse tunnel from the care-of-address if the bit is set in a registration request (figure 5, code field 104, care-of-address 112 and column 8, lines 61-64 and column 9, lines 24-26).

4. In regards to claims 5 and 21, Magret anticipates receiving a registration request from a mobile node; the mobile node having a home agent, the registration request also representing a call is anticipated by figures 7, 8 and 9 respectively.

In further regards, Magret anticipates assigning a tunnel identifier to the call associated with the registration request, wherein the tunnel identifier is independent of a home address of the mobile node and an address of the home agent. Magret discloses that the home agent invokes an encapsulation process to create a first tunnel having the temporary address as an endpoint and a second tunnel having the foreign agent care-of-address as a destination address. As a side note, the process works in such a way that an inbound packet is encapsulated into another packet having the foreign agent care-of-address as a destination address. Therefore, since the second tunnel has a foreign agent care-of-address, it anticipates a tunnel identifier that is independent of the

home address of the mobile node and independent of the address of the home agent (see figures 10A-10C and column 11, lines 20-44).

In further regards, Magret also anticipates forwarding the registration request to the home agent, the request including the tunnel identifier in figure 11B step 220 where a packet can be reverse tunneled to the home agent by the foreign agent. It is noted the packet can be a registration message itself.

In further regards, establishing a connection is anticipated by the transmitting registration request step 120 in figure 7 and the receiving registration request step 140 in figure 8. It is noted that in order to transmit and receive a registration request, a connection must be established.

In further regards, receiving a registration response and forwarding the registration response to the mobile node is anticipated by step 140 in figure 8 where a foreign agent receives the registration request and by step 148 where the registration reply is transmitted to the mobile node.

In further regards, receiving packets of data from the home agent, each of the packets of data including the tunnel identifier is anticipated by step 192 in figure 10B where the foreign agent receives encapsulated packet from the home agent. It is noted that the encapsulated packet is composed of an inner and an outer tunnels respectively (see figure 10A steps 186 and 188).

In further regards, the reverse tunneling step 220 in figure 11B where the outgoing inner packet is reverse anticipates using the tunnel identifier to identify the

Art Unit: 2666

connection for packets having the tunnel identifier tunneled to the appropriate home agent.

5. In regards to claims 9 and 22, receiving a registration request is anticipated by figures 7, 8, and 9 respectively.

In further regards, receiving a data stream, the data stream associated with the registration request, the data stream including a plurality of packets is anticipated by step 120 in figure 7 where the mobile node sends a registration request packet to the foreign agent.

In further regards, assigning an identifier to the data stream, wherein the identifier is independent of a home address of a mobile node and an address of a home agent for the mobile node is anticipated by the disclosure that that the home agent invokes an encapsulation process to create a first tunnel having the temporary address as an endpoint and a second tunnel having the foreign agent care-of-address as a destination address. As a side note, the process works in such a way that an inbound packet is encapsulated into another packet having the foreign agent care-of-address as a destination address. Therefore, since the second tunnel has a foreign agent care-of-address, it anticipates a tunnel identifier that is independent of the home address of the mobile node and independent of the address of the home agent (see figures 10A-10C and column 11, lines 20-44).

In further regards, transmitting the registration request to the home agent, the registration request including the identifier is anticipated by steps 150 and 152 in figure

Art Unit: 2666

8. In step 150, the "T" bit is set to indicate a request to have support for reverse tunneling and at step 152, the request is forwarded to the home agent.

In further regards, steps 168 and 172 in figure 9 anticipate receiving return packets of information, the return packets of information including the identifier. In step 168, the registration engine of the home agent, inquire if the "T" bit is set in the code field to support reverse tunneling, if yes then the message is forwarded indicating that registration has been granted (see figure 9 and column 11, lines 6-16).

In further regards, translating the identifier into a connection and transmitting the return packets using the connection is anticipated by the mobility binding cache update step 170 in figure 9 where the entry associates the mobile node's home address to the foreign agent care-of-address (see figure 9 and column 10, lines 56-64).

6. In regards to claim 13, mobile nodes 12 and 16 in figure 1 anticipate the mobile node.

In further regards, a packet data-switching node (PDSN), the PDSN communicatively coupled to the mobile node, the PDSN receiving a registration request from the mobile node, the PDSN assigning a tunnel identifier to a plurality of packets received from the mobile node is anticipated by home agents 28 and 30. It is noted that the home agents can be gateway devices such as switches and routers for forwarding packetized communications. The home agents support the function of mobile IP by tunneling to the foreign agent data packets addressed to the mobile nodes (see figure 1, home agents 28 and 30 and column 5, lines 14-20)



In further regards, a home agent coupled to the PDSN, the home agent receiving and storing the tunnel identifier in the registration request and sending return packets to the PDSN including the tunnel identifier is also anticipated by the same disclosure used with regards to the previous limitation.

In further regards, the tunnel identifier being independent of a home address of the mobile node and an address of the home agent is also anticipated by Magret. Magret discloses that the home agent invokes an encapsulation process to create a first tunnel having the temporary address as an endpoint and a second tunnel having the foreign agent care-of-address as a destination address. As a side note, the process works in such a way that an inbound packet is encapsulated into another packet having the foreign agent care-of-address as a destination address. Therefore, since the second tunnel has a foreign agent care-of-address, it anticipates a tunnel identifier that is independent of the home address of the mobile node and independent of the address of the home agent (see figures 10A-10C and column 11, lines 20-44).

In further regards, the PDSN receiving a response message from the home agent and establishes a connection between the mobile node and the home agent is also anticipated by figure 10B step 192 when the Home Agent receives encapsulated packet.

In further regards, the PDSN extracting the tunnel identifier from the return packets and translating the tunnel identifier into information representative of the connection, and transmitting the return packets on the connection is anticipated by the reverse tunneling step 220 in figure 11B where the outgoing inner packet is reverse

Art Unit: 2666

tunneled to the appropriate home agent and by the encapsulation/decapsulation engine 66 which receives a packet addressed to the mobile ode and encapsulates it form tunneling to the foreign agent.

In regards to claim 14, the system wherein the tunnel identifier is included in a header in the return packet is anticipated by figure 5 code field 104 and the care of address field 112 which includes "T" bit indicating a request to the home agent to accept a reverse tunnel form the care-of-address if the bit is set in a registration request (figure 5, code field 104, care-of-address 112 and column 8, lines 61-64 and column 9, lines 24-26).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3-4, 6, 10-11 and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Magret (US Patent No. 6856624 B2) in view of Leung et al. (U.S. Patent 6466964 B1).

9. In regards to claims 3 and 4, Magret teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 2 as stated above. Magret fails to particularly disclose, extracting from the tunnel identifier from the header and locating a tunnel table entry in a tunnel table and the

Art Unit: 2666

tunnel table indicating an entry in a connection table. Leung teaches the above-mentioned limitations.

In regards to claim 3, the foreign agent has a visiting table that includes the respective IP addresses of the node, the home agent and an interface with specifies the tunnel (column 13, lines 30-35).

In regards to claim 4, the home agent includes a mobility binding table (column 16 lines 20-23) and routing table that includes a node IP address and a next hop router IP address (column 16 lines 42-48). The next hop router IP address corresponds to the router that the packet should be forwarded to. The mobility-binding table includes a tunnel interface. It is inherent that the two tables can interact with each other and therefore, the tunnel interface can identify a route for the packet.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include the visiting table and the particular mobility-binding table discloses by Leung into the system disclosed by Magret. The proper motivation comes from Leung where it is stated "it would be desirable to have techniques for implementing mobility in nodes without implementing mobility support in the nodes themselves" (see columns 2 and 3, last paragraph of the background of the invention).

10. In regards to claim 6, Magret teaches all the limitations of claim 5 as stated above. Magret fails to particularly disclose, using the tunnel identifier to identify the connection including looking in a connection table for connection information corresponding to the tunnel identifier. Leung teaches the above-mentioned limitation.

In regards to claim 6, the foreign agent has a visitor table that along with the IP

addresses of the home agent and the mobile node includes an interface that specifies a particular tunnel for a connection (column 13 lines 30-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the visitor table disclosed by Leung into the system disclosed by Magret. The proper motivation comes from Leung where it is stated "it would be desirable to have techniques for implementing mobility in nodes without implementing mobility support in the nodes themselves" (see columns 2 and 3, last paragraph of the background of the invention).

11. In regards to claims 10 and 11, Magret teaches all the limitations of claim 9 as stated above, Magret fails to particularly disclose, the step of translating which includes establishing a tunnel table, the tunnel table having entries corresponding to tunnel identifiers and establishing a connection table, the connection table including connection information for entries in the tunnel table.

In regards to claim 10, the foreign agent has a visitor table that along with the IP addresses of the home agent and the mobile node includes an interface that specifies a particular tunnel for a connection (column 13 lines 30-35).

In regards to claim 11, the home agent has a mobility binding table that includes the care of address for the mobile node and the tunnel interface to connect to the care of address; in this instance the care of address is the address of the foreign agent (column 16 lines 17-21).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the visitor table disclosed by Leung into the system

Art Unit: 2666

disclosed by Magret. The proper motivation comes from Leung where it is stated "it would be desirable to have techniques for implementing mobility in nodes without implementing mobility support in the nodes themselves" (see columns 2 and 3, last paragraph of the background of the invention).

12. In regards to claim 19, Magret teaches all the limitations of claims 17 and 18 as stated above. Magret fails to particularly disclose, a means for extracting the tunnel identifier from the header and locating a tunnel table entry in a tunnel table. In regards to claim 19, the foreign agent has a visiting table that includes the respective IP addresses of the node, the home agent and an interface with specifies the tunnel (column 13, lines 30-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the visitor table disclosed by Leung into the system disclosed by Magret. The proper motivation comes from Leung where it is stated "it would be desirable to have techniques for implementing mobility in nodes without implementing mobility support in the nodes themselves" (see columns 2 and 3, last paragraph of the background of the invention).

13. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Magret (US Patent No. 6856624 B2) as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Farinacci et al. (RFC 2748: Generic Routing Encapsulation (GRE)). Magret teaches all the limitations of claim 5 as stated above. Magret fails to teach the limitation of having a GRE header in the packet. Farinacci teaches the above-mentioned limitation. The

Art Unit: 2666

system has a packet that needs to be encapsulated and delivered. The payload is first encapsulated in a GRE packet and the resulting packet is then encapsulated in some other protocol before being forwarded (page 2, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph, sentences 3-5). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to implement the header claimed in claim 5 and encapsulated the packet using the GRE protocol specified by Farinacci. The proper motivation comes from Farinacci where it is stated "It is the attempt of this protocol to provide a simple, general purpose mechanism which reduces the problem of encapsulation from its current size to a more manageable size" (page 2, 1<sup>st</sup> incomplete paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> sentence).

14. Claims 7, 12, 15, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Magret et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6856624 B2) as applied to claims 5 and 6 above, and further in view of Madour (U.S. Publication 20020021681 A1).

15. In regards to claim 7, Magret teaches all the limitations of claims 5 and 6 as stated above. Magret fails to teach the limitations of implementing the connection information from a Point-to-point protocol (PPP). Madour teaches the above-mentioned limitation (page 1, paragraph 11, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence). It is explicitly stated that the mobile station stores PPP protocol context information and has a PPP connection with the foreign agent (first PDSN). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the connection information using the PPP protocol disclosed by Madour into the method disclosed by Magret. The proper motivation comes from Madour where it is stated "The possibility to handoff in a radio

telecommunications network is obviously important; it is after all one of the features that make radio telecommunications mobile. Thus it can be seen that having a good handoff mechanisms is important in these networks, and there is a drive for more efficient handoff mechanisms" (page 1, paragraph 5, 1<sup>st</sup> two sentences).

16. In regards to claim 12, Magret teaches all the limitations of claim 9 as stated above. Magret fails to teach the limitations of implementing the connection information from a Point-to-point protocol (PPP). Madour teaches the above-mentioned limitation (page 1, paragraph 11, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence). It is explicitly stated that the mobile station stores PPP protocol context information and has a PPP connection with the foreign agent (first PDSN). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the connection information using the PPP protocol disclosed by Madour into the method disclosed by Magret. The proper motivation comes from Madour where it is stated "The possibility to handoff in a radio telecommunications network is obviously important; it is after all one of the features that make radio telecommunications mobile. Thus it can be seen that having a good handoff mechanisms is important in these networks, and there is a drive for more efficient handoff mechanisms" (page 1, paragraph 5, 1<sup>st</sup> two sentences).

17. In regards to claim 15, Magret teaches all the limitations of claim 13 as stated above. Magret fails to teach the limitations of implementing the connection information from a Point-to-point protocol (PPP). Madour teaches the above-mentioned limitation (page 1, paragraph 11, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence). It is explicitly stated that the mobile station stores PPP protocol context information and has a PPP connection with the foreign agent (first

Art Unit: 2666

PDSN). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the connection information using the PPP protocol disclosed by Madour into the system disclosed by Magret. The proper motivation comes from Madour where it is stated "The possibility to handoff in a radio telecommunications network is obviously important; it is after all one of the features that make radio telecommunications mobile. Thus it can be seen that having a good handoff mechanisms is important in these networks, and there is a drive for more efficient handoff mechanisms" (page 1, paragraph 5, 1<sup>st</sup> two sentences).

18. In regards to claim 16, Magret teaches all the limitation of claim 13 as stated above. Magret fails to teach the limitation of having a tunnel entry table and a PPP connection table. Madour teaches the above-mentioned limitation. The PDSN includes a memory unit used to store PPP context information which includes the connection information regarding the PPP protocol and the information is exchanged using a tunnel between the home and foreign PDSNs (page 4 paragraph 43, last line and Page 5, paragraph 52, sentences 2-4 and figure 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include a PDSN with the PPP context information memory unit disclosed by Madour into the system disclosed by Magret. The proper motivation comes from Madour where it is stated "The possibility to handoff in a radio telecommunications network is obviously important; it is after all one of the features that make radio telecommunications mobile. Thus it can be seen that having a good handoff mechanisms is important in these networks, and there is a drive for more efficient handoff mechanisms" (page 1, paragraph 5, 1<sup>st</sup> two sentences).



Art Unit: 2666

19. In regards to claim 20, Magret teaches all the limitation of claims 17 and 19 as stated above. Magret fails to teach the limitation of a tunnel entry indicating an entry in a PPP connection table. Madour teaches the above-mentioned limitation. The PDSN includes a memory unit used to store PPP context information which includes the connection information regarding the PPP protocol and the information is exchanged using a tunnel between the home and foreign PDSNs (page 4 paragraph 43, last line and Page 5, paragraph 52, sentences 2-4 and figure 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include a PDSN with the PPP context information memory unit disclosed by Madour into the system disclosed by Magret. The proper motivation comes from Madour where it is stated "The possibility to handoff in a radio telecommunications network is obviously important; it is after all one of the features that make radio telecommunications mobile. Thus it can be seen that having a good handoff mechanisms is important in these networks, and there is a drive for more efficient handoff mechanisms" (page 1, paragraph 5, 1<sup>st</sup> two sentences).

### ***Response to Arguments***

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2666

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay P. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3086. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 am - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (571) 272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jpp 8/9/05  
Jay P. Patel  
Assistant Examiner  
Art Unit 2666



DANSTON  
PATENT EXAMINER